

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION

Reginald Barksdale,)	C.A. No. 3:06-99
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	ORDER
)	
Joey Preston, County Manager; Arlette)	
Jones, Captain, Medical; Cindy Haist, RN,)	
Anderson County Detention Center,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

This action was filed by *pro se* Plaintiff Reginald Barksdale (“Plaintiff”) on January 20, 2006. (Doc. # 1). The Defendants, Joey Preston, Arlette Jones, and Cindy Haist (“Defendants”), filed a motion for summary judgment on June 15, 2006. (Doc. #26). As the Plaintiff is proceeding *pro se*, an Order pursuant to Roseboro v. Garrison, 528 F.2d 309 (4th Cir. 1975) was issued on June 20, 2006, advising the Plaintiff of the importance of a motion for summary judgment. (Doc. #30). The Plaintiff was specifically advised that he had 34 days to respond and that if he failed to respond adequately, the Defendants’ motion may be granted, thereby ending his case. *Id.* Plaintiff filed numerous motions and what appear to be statements of his claim, but did not file any materials in opposition to summary judgment. Plaintiff requested and was granted an extension of time to respond until December 8, 2006. (Docs. #37, 38). However, to date he has provided no response to the Defendants’ pending motion. On December 14, 2006, Magistrate Judge Joseph R. McCrorey, to whom this matter had been previously assigned, issued a Report and Recommendation (“the

Report”) in this case recommending that the Defendants’ motion for summary judgment be granted. (Doc. #61). To date, the Plaintiff has filed no objections to the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation.¹ This matter is now before the Court upon the Magistrate Judge’s Report.

This Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. § 636. In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

The Court has carefully reviewed the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation, and for the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation is **ACCEPTED** (Doc. #61), and the Defendants’ motion for summary judgment is **GRANTED**. In light of this Order, all pending motions in this matter are hereby rendered moot.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

S/ Terry L. Wooten

Terry L. Wooten
United States District Judge

March 5, 2007
Florence, South Carolina

¹The Court notes the Report was mailed to the Plaintiff on two separate occasions at the address and to the names, both Reginald Barksdale and Reginald Freeman, that he provided to the Clerk of Court but returned as undeliverable. (Entries #62, 63). The Court further notes that the Magistrate Judge issued an Order in this case on January 23, 2006, informing the Plaintiff he was to keep the Clerk of Court informed in writing of any address changes. (Doc. #3).